

REMARKS

[0003] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 1-9, 18-21, 23 and 24 are presently pending before the amendment. After this amendment, claims 1-4, 7, 9, 21-23 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 5-6, 8, 19-20, and 24 are amended to depend upon newly added claims. Claims 25-41 are newly added.

Statement of Substance of Interview

[0004] The Examiner graciously talked with me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—on May 7, 2007. Applicant greatly appreciates the Examiner's willingness to talk. Such willingness is invaluable to both of us in our common goal of an expedited prosecution of this patent application.

[0005] During the interview, Applicant discussed how the claims differed from the cited art, namely Thebaut. Without conceding the propriety of the rejections and in the interest of expediting prosecution, also proposed several possible clarifying amendments. Applicant also proposed to amend specification to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection.

[0006] Applicant herein amends the claims in the manner discussed during the interview. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the pending claims are allowable over the cited art of record for at least the reasons discussed during the interview.

Formal Request for an Interview

[0007] If the Examiner's reply to this communication is anything other than allowance of all pending claims, then I formally request an interview with the Examiner.

I encourage the Examiner to call me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—so that we can talk about this matter so as to resolve any outstanding issues quickly and efficiently over the phone.

[0008] Please contact me or my assistant to schedule a date and time for a telephone interview that is most convenient for both of us. While email works great for us, I welcome your call to either of us as well. Our contact information may be found on the last page of this response.

Claim Amendments and Additions

[0009] Without conceding the propriety of the rejections herein and in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claims 5-6, 8, 19-20, and 24 herein.

[0010] Furthermore, Applicant adds new claims 25-41 herein, which are directed towards a method, computer readable media, and a system. These new claims are fully supported by Application and therefore do not constitute new matter.

[0011] For example, claim 25 recites, *inter alia*, a receiving step for “receiving all event data generated by a plurality of event providers in a network and all inquiries requesting the event data from a plurality of event consumers ..., wherein the event data is represented in a common data format..., and wherein the inquiries comprise the event data subscribed by the plurality of event consumers,” a determining step for “determining, in accordance with one or more event handling policies, whether the event data is subscribed by one or more of a plurality of event consumers,” and a sending step for “sending the subscribed event data to the plurality of event consumers that subscribe the event data, wherein the event data is represented in the same common data format as it is generated by

the plurality of event providers.” Support for the amendment can be found throughout the application, for example, Figs. 1 and 3 with the associated text. Claims 30 and 34 incorporate the same feature, and these claims are supported by the application too.

[0012] Therefore, no new matter will be introduced by the amendment. Entry to the file is respectfully requested.

Substantive Matters

Claim Rejections under § 101

[0013] Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for including “modulated data signal”. In light of the amendments presented herein and the agreement reached during the above-discussed Examiner Interview, Applicant submits that these claims comply with the patentability requirements of § 101 and that the § 101 rejections should be withdrawn. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw these rejections.

Claim Rejections under § 102

[0014] Claims 1-9, 18-21, and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,889,953 to Thebaut et al. (“Thebaut”). By this amendment, claims 1-4, 7, 9, 21-23 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 5-6, 8, 19-20, and 24 are amended to depend upon newly added claims, rendering these rejections moot.

[0015] Independent claim 25 is added to recite the invention in a different way. Claim 25 recites:

A method comprising:
receiving all event data generated by a plurality of event providers in a network and all inquiries requesting the event data from a plurality of event consumers, the event providers and event consumers comprising different components in the network, wherein the event data is represented in a common data format regardless of which event provider generates the event data, and wherein the inquiries comprise the event data subscribed by the plurality of event consumers;
determining, in accordance with one or more event handling policies, whether the event data is subscribed the a plurality of event consumers; and
sending the event data to the plurality of event consumers that subscribe the event data, wherein the event data is represented in the same common data format as it is generated by the plurality of event providers.

[0016] Applicant submits that the features recited in claim 25 are not taught, disclosed or suggested in Thebaut.

[0017] Thebaut is directed to a method and apparatus for determining an enforceable policy applicable to one or more network devices. As disclosed in Fig. 1, Thebaut teaches, *inter alia*, using a policy framework to enforce a rule when a particular event is triggered. In order to monitor the configuration of network devices, a policy-based configuration manager (PCM) is established to keep an inventory of network devices, to verify the configuration of each device, and to reset or update configurations as appropriate or necessary. Moreover, Thebaut teaches a method to solve conflicts in different policy rules (See Fig. 14b).

[0018] However, claim 25 is patentably distinct from Thebaut, because Thebaut fails to teach each and every feature recited in claim 25. For example, claim 25 teaches, *inter alia*, receiving all event data from event providers and all inquiries from event consumers subscribing one or more event data, and sending the subscribed event data to the requesting event consumer in accordance with the event handling policies. This

feature, is nowhere in Thebaut. According to Thebaut, as shown in Fig. 9, a policy is attached to source and destination pairs. In other words, Thebaut is completely silent in receiving inquiries including subscription of event data from event consumers and sending the subscribed event data to the event consumer.

[0019] Moreover, Thebaut fails to teach generating event data using a common data format and then sending the event data to event consumers in the same common data format. According to Thebaut, “[t]he inputs to the driver are a trigger 13, and domain structure 112, and a set of configuration records 114 attached to elements in the domain space. The output of the driver is an action space 117 (ultimately sent to network 118 or to the network management system 31 in FIG 3) which may comprise one or more of a configuration load; a notice of conflicting configurations; a notice of “no action required”; and a report of the state of overall network configuration.” (Thebaut, col. 6, lines 51-61). Apparently, the input and output of Thebaut use different format in triggering an event and conveying the policy from Policy driver 116.

[0020] Accordingly, claim 25 is asserted patentably distinct from Thebaut. Since claims 30 and 34 incorporate the same features, they are respectfully asserted patentably distinct from Thebaut for at least the same reasons.

[0021] Finally, Applicant has not specifically addressed the rejections of the dependent claims. Applicant respectfully submits that the independent claims, from which they depend, are in condition for allowance as set forth above. Accordingly, the dependent claims also are in condition for allowance. Applicant, however, reserves the right to address such rejections of the dependent claims in the future as appropriate.

Conclusion

[0022] All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Examiner is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action.** Please call/email me or my assistant at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 06/06/2007

By: Ningning Xu

Ningning Xu
Reg. No. L0293
(509) 324-9256 x226
ningning@leehayes.com
www.leehayes.com

My Assistant: Carly Bokarica
(509) 324-9256 x264
carly@leehayes.com